

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-14 and 16 are pending and under consideration.

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

### I. Examiner Interview

Appreciation is expressed to the Examiner for the telephone interview granted by the Examiner on September 28, 2009. During the interview, further amending independent claim 1 to overcome the cited prior art was discussed. Accordingly, Applicants have submitted the following amendments and remarks in accordance with this discussion. Other points raised during the interview are also included in the comments below.

### II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nixon et al. ("Nixon", U.S. Patent No. 6,032,208).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

automatically creating the technology module by allocating at least one signaling functional element, at least one archive data functional element that archives state or process data of the process element over a predetermined period of time, and at least one picture functional element to the process element based on the selected type of the at least one process element.

As such, the archive data functional element of claim 1 represents state or process data of the process element that has been archived over a predetermined period of time (see paragraph [013] of the specification). Nixon discloses that a microprocessor or computer associates each of the functions or elements defined by the function blocks with predefined templates stored in a library. Thus, the predefined templates of Nixon do not correspond to the claimed archive data functional element of claim 1. Furthermore, Nixon does not disclose archiving state or process data of the process element and using the archived data for automatically creating a technology module. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 distinguishes over Nixon for at least this reason.

Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended to recite:

wherein the technology module and the at least one signaling element, archive data element or picture element are stored as a

logically connected unit at a specific memory location.

As such, the individual elements can be found together with the technology module at a specific memory location, so that no separate memory locations have to be registered. It is respectfully submitted that this feature of claim 1 is not taught by Nixon.

Since Nixon does not discuss or suggest all of the features of claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Nixon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-14 and 16 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the reference relied upon. Therefore, claims 2-14 and 16 patentably distinguish over the reference relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 102(b) rejections is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9-28-09

By:



Aaron C. Walker  
Registration No. 59,921

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501